UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/872,686	05/31/2001	G. Eric Engstrom	112076-138340	2508

25943   7590   04/07/2008
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.
PACWEST CENTER, SUITE 1900
1211 SW FIFTH AVENUE
PORTLAND, OR 97204

EXAMINER
TRUONG, CAM Y T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2162	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/07/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Application Number: 09/872,686
Filing Date: May 31, 2001
Appellant(s): ENGSTROM, G. ERIC

_____

For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 1/10/2008 appealing from the Office action

mailed 10/17/2007.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

US 4,881,179	Vincent	3-1988
US 6,369,840	Barnett et al	3-1999
US 5,930,801	Falkenhaimer et al	10-1997

US 7,106, 843   Gainsboro et al   08-1998

US 6,910, 049   Fenton et al   07-2001

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1-5, 8-17, 29-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Vincent (US 4881179) in view of Barnett et al (or hereinafter

"Barnett") (US 6369840).

As to claim 1, Vincent teaches the claimed limitations:

"receiving an input for a first time-slot of a plurality of time-slots of a first party's

calendar from a second party" as receiving a non-owner or a user first enters the start

time and end times of the event being calendared into columns 47 and 48 of a owner's

L.M. The owner L.M is represented as a first party. The non-owner is represented as a

second party (col. 9, lines 30-32; col. 10, lines 22-30),

"the first and second parties being different parties" as serving a request by a

user to view the calendar of another user (col. 10, lines 15-16). For example, fig. 5

represents the screen displayed to a non-owner who has requested a view of the day

calendar of L.M (owner). The above information shows the non-owner or a user whom

request for viewing and L.M or owner are different parties;

"the second party being associated with a group affiliation or a user type

or both" as serving a request by a user to view the calendar of another user (col. 10,

lines 15-16). For example, fig. 5 represents the screen displayed to a non-owner who

has requested a view of the day calendar of L.M (owner). The user who requests for

viewing calendar of another user such as L.M, is non-owner. The L.M is owner as user

type. As discussed above, the user who requests for viewing calendar of another user

such as L.M, is associated with owner as user type;

"the group affiliation or user type or both having one or more defined access

privileges" as fig. 5 represents the screen displayed to a non-owner who has requested

a view of the day calendar of L.M (owner) (col. 10, lines 20-30). L.M is an owner as

user type having defined access permission for timeslots 5:00pm to 6:00pm and

8:00pm;

"wherein the one or more defined access privileges are defined for specific time-

slots of the plurality of time-slots of the first party's calendar" as at a time slot 5pm to

6pm Access permission required, at another time slot 8:00 pm Access permission

required (fig. 5). The above information shows that access privileges are defined for

time-slots. There are 5 levels of access permission not including the access permission

level established for an owner to view his own calendar that includes time slots (col. 9,

lines 60-67; col. 10, lines 3-5).

Vincent does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "processing said received input in accordance with the access privilege of the second party's associated group affiliation or user type or both for the first time-slot".

Barnett teaches accepting input specifying a group of users to have access to the group calendar, designating a permitted level of access for each user in the group, and then accepting input from a second user requesting access to the group calendar (col. 28, lines 50-55). Pages 313-315 allow a user to select individual events from the selected categories, to be added to the personal calendar (col. 8, lines 35-37). For example, after a user clicks on one or more box 904 in time slots as shown in fig. 9 and then clicks on button 807, the events are added to his or her personal calendar (col. 12, lines 40-41, figs. 9&14). As discussed above, events that are clicked by a user are processed in according to a permitted level of access for each user in the group.

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Barnett's teaching of after a user clicks on one or more box 904 in time slots as shown in fig. 9 and then clicks on button 807, the events are added to user calendar according to a permitted level of access for each user in the group to Vincent's system in order to allow a user to add information from an owner's calendar to his or her calendar in sequence of time accordance with a security access level to prevent network traffic or to prevent copying owner's information without permission .

As to claim 2, Vincent and Barnett teaches the claimed limitation subject matter

1, Barnett further teaches "defining, before said receiving, the access privileges of the group affiliation or both or user type, for the plurality of time-slots of said calendar" as a user can set up a group calendar, specifying the members in the group, where every group member can access the calendar and make changes to it.

Different levels of access can be specified for different member members of the group (col. 2, lines 61-64).

As to claim 3, Vincent teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the access Privileges include a first access privilege with an ability to read data of said first time-slot, and an ability to write data into the first time-slot" as (figs. 4A and 5).

As to claim 4, Vincent teaches the claimed limitations:

"receiving a request for calendar entry or entries for a first time-slot of a plurality of time-slots of a first party's calendar, wherein the request is submitted by a second party associated with a group affiliation or user type or both" as a non-owner who has requested a view of the day calendar of L.M. User that was shown in figs. 4A and 4B. The requesting non-owner has an access level of 3 so that all time slots having calendared events are shown and all descriptions except secret and personal are displayed. The above information shows that the system process user's input. The non-owner is not associated with group affiliation and/or user time (col. 53-67; col. 10, lines 1-15),

"the first and second parties being different parties" as non-owner is different

from the calendar's owner (col. 10, lines 20-30) ,

"the group affiliation or user type or both having one or more defined access

privileges" as non-owner such as administrative assistant or secretary having a plurality

of access levels to a owner calendar for the plurality of time- slots of the owner's

calendar (col. 9, lines 53-67; col. 10, lines 20-38),

"wherein the one or more defined access privileges are defined for specific time-

slots of the plurality of time-slots of the first-party's calendar" as at a time slot 5pm to

6pm Access permission required, at another time slot 8:00 pm Access permission

required (fig. 5). The above information shows that access privileges are defined for

time-slots. There are 5 levels of access permission not including the access permission

level established for an owner to view his own calendar that includes time slots (col. 9,

lines 60-67; col. 10, lines 3-5).

Vincent does not explicitly teach the limitation "selectively providing calendar

entry for the first time-slot, in accordance with the one or more defined access privileges

of the group affiliation or user type or both for the first time-slot".

Vincent teaches as at a time slot 5pm to 6pm Access permission required, at

another time slot 8:00 pm Access permission required (fig. 5). The above information

shows that access privileges are defined for time-slots. There are 5 levels of access

permission not including the access permission level established for an owner to view

his own calendar that includes time slots (col. 9, lines 60-67; col. 10, lines 3-5).

Barnett teaches after a user clicks on one or more box 904 in time slots as

shown in fig. 9 and then clicks on button 807, the events are added to user calendar

according to access privilege for the time slots (figs. 9 &13, col. 12, lines 30-41; col. 7,

lines 55-65; col. 28, lines 90-65).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the ad at the time

the invention was made to apply Barnett's teaching of after a user clicks on one or more

box 904 in time slots as shown in fig. 9 and then clicks on button 807, the events are

added to user calendar according to access privilege for the time slots to Vincent's

system in order to allow a user to add information from an owner's calendar to his or her

calendar in sequence of time accordance with a security access level to prevent

network traffic or to prevent copying owner's information without permission .

As to claim 5, Vincent teaches the claimed limitation "defining, before said

receiving, the access privileges of the group affiliation or user type or both, for the time-

slots of said calendar" as displaying to a non-owner who has requested a view of the

day calendar of LM. The requesting non-owner has an access level of 3 so that all time

slots having calendared events are shown and all descriptions except secret and

personal are displayed. The calendar owner allow a specified person to have access to

his calendar at a specified security level which may be different that the general access

level that has been assigned to that person by the system. This function allows a

calendar owner to grant access to his calendar to an administrative assistant or

Secretary. The above information shows that the system defines time slots of the

calendar. The system does not define the access privileges of the group affiliation (col.

10, lines 20-40).

Vincent does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation group affiliation". Barnett teaches a user can set up a group calendar, specifying the members in the group, where every group member can access the calendar and make changes to it. Different levels of access can be specified for different member members of the group (col. 2, lines 61-64).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Barnett's teaching of a user can set up a group calendar, specifying the members in the group, where every group member can access the calendar and make changes to it. Different levels of access can be specified for different member members of the group to Vincent's system in order to allow a user to share selected calendar information with other users of a group in a security level access.

As to claim 8, Vincent teaches the claimed limitations:

"designating by a computer system one or more defined access privileges for a plurality of time-slots of a first user's calendar for a user group or user type or both" as designated a plurality of access levels to a plurality of time slots of a owner's calendar for an administrative assistant type and not for a user group (col. 9, lines 52- 67; col. 1 0, lines 1 -1 0),

"wherein the one or more defined access privileges are defined for specific time-slots of the plurality of time-slots of the first party's calendar" as there are 5 levels of

access permission not including the access permission level established for an owner

to view his own calendar that includes time slots. The above information shows that the

system defined access levels for time slots of the calendar (fig. 4A, col. 9, lines 60-67;

col. 10, lines 3-5),

"granting or denying access by the computer system to a first time-slot of the

plurality of time-slots to said second user in accordance with the one or more defined

access privileges for the first time-slot of the user group or type or both determined for

said second user" as grant access to a owner's calendar of the plurality of time-slots in

accordance with access level 3 for the start time slot of user type (col. 10, lines 20-40).

Vincent does not explicitly teach the claimed limitations "determining

by said computer system that a second user being a member of said user group or type

or both". Barnett teaches a user can set up a group calendar, specifying the members in

the group, where every group member can access the calendar and make changes to it.

Different levels of access can be specified for different member members of the group

(col. 2, lines 61-64).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the ad at the time

the invention was made to apply Barnett's teaching of a user can set up a group

calendar, specifying the members in the group, where every group member can access

the calendar and make changes to it. Different levels of access can be specified for

different member members of the group to Vincent's system in order to allow a user to

share selected calendar information with other users of a group in a security level

access.

As to claim 9, Vincent does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein said second user has a user identification identifiable to the user group or user type or both".

Barnett teaches a user may elect to login at this point by providing input specifying a login identifier and password. This allows system 100 to retrieve user-specific information, by reference to a record stored in database 104 of the system. If the user has not used the system before, he or she is prompted to sign up in 302, by selecting a login identifier and password for future reference. A new record is created and stored for the user. The user is also given the option of signing up in a group using the group sign-up page 304, which allows the user to share his or her calendar with other members of selected groups. Page 303 contains a description of groups and their operation (col. 7, lines 45-67).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Barnett's teaching of a user may elect to login at this point by providing input specifying a login identifier and password. This allows system 100 to retrieve user-specific information, by reference to a record stored in database 104 of the system. If the user has not used the system before, he or she is prompted to sign up in 302, by selecting a login identifier and password for future reference. A new record is created and stored for the user. The user is also given the option of signing up in a group using the group sign-up page 304, which allows the user to share his or her calendar with other members of selected groups. Page 303 contains a description

of groups and their operation to Vincent's system in order to allow a non-owner to

access a owner's calendar for update owner's calendar.

As to claim 10, Vincent does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "reading

into said computer system said second user's user identification and said access

privileges". Barnett teaches a user may elect to login at this point by providing input

specifying a login identifier and password. This allows system 100 to retrieve user-

specific information, by reference to a record stored in database 104 of the system. If

the user has not used the system before, he or she is prompted to sign up in 302, by

selecting a login identifier and password for future reference. A new record is created

and stored for the user. The user is also given the option of signing up in a group

using the group sign-up page 304, which allows the user to share his or her calendar

with other members of selected groups. Different access can assign to different

member of group. Page 303 contains a description of groups and their operation (col.

7, lines 45-67; col. 2, lines 60-65).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Barnett's teaching of a user may elect to login at this

point by providing input specifying a login identifier and password. This allows system

100 to retrieve user-specific information, by reference to a record stored in database

104 of the system. If the user has not used the system before, he or she is prompted to

sign up in 302, by selecting a login identifier and password for future reference. A new

record is created and stored for the user. The user is also given the option of signing

up in a group using the group sign-up page 304, which allows the user to share his or

her calendar with other members of selected groups. Page 303 contains a description

of groups and their operation to Vincent's system in order to allow a non-owner to

access a owner's calendar for update owner's calendar.

As to claim 11 , Vincent teaches the claimed limitation "including the

computer 'system facilitating said first user in providing said use group or user type or

both and said access privileges" as providing a plurality of access levels to a plurality

of time slots of an owner's calendar for an administrative assistant type (fig. 5, col. 9,

lines 52-67., col. 10, lines 1-10).

As to claim 12, Vincent teaches the claimed limitation "facilitating the second

user in inputting data into the first time-slot, the user group or user type or both having

an access privilege to the first time-slot including an ability to write data into the first

time slot" as receiving a non-owner or a user first enters the start time and end times of

the event being calendared into columns 47 and 48 of a owner's L.M. The owner L.M is

represented as a first party. The non-owner is represented as a second party. The

above information shows that the user (not user group) having an access privilege to

write data into the start time slot (col. 9, lines 30-32., col. 10, lines 22-30).

Barnett teaches a user can set up a group calendar, specifying the members in

the group, where every group member can access the calendar and make changes to it.

Different levels of access can be specified for different member members of the group

(col. 2, lines 61-64).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the ad at the time the invention was made to apply Barnett's teaching of a user can set up a group calendar, specifying the members in the group, where every group member can access the calendar and make changes to it. Different levels of access can be specified for different member members of the group to Vincent's system in order to allow a user to share selected calendar information with other users of a group in a security level access.

As to claim 13, Vincent teaches the claimed limitation "wherein said calendar includes an event that spans the first and at least a second time-slot, and the method fudher comprises said computer system omitting descriptive data of said event when said second user accesses said first time slot, if said user group or user type or both does not has read access to all of said at least a second time-slot, even if said user group or user type or both has read access to said first time-slot" as (figs. 4A-5).

As to claim 14, Vincent does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation " including the computer system facilitating the second user in editing data ….time-slot".

Barnett teaches a user can select individual event categories and/or subdivisions for display in Favorite Events pages 313-315. Selecting an event category in this manner is referred to as "subscribing" to the event category. Favorite Events pages 313-315 display selected events in either a Day View 313, a Week View

314, or a Month View 315. Pages 313-315 allow a user to select individual

events from the selected categories, to be added to the personal calendar. The

user can also access an Edit Favorites page 316 which allows him or her to add

or remove categories and/or subdivisions from display in favorite Events pages

313-315. The user can set up a group calendar, specifying the members in the group,

where every group member can access the calendar and make changes to it. Different

levels of access can be specified for different members of the group. The user can

also import events from other users' calendars. In addition, purchases of products,

services, or tickets can be effected using links associated with displayed

events (col. 2, lines 55-67., col. 8, lines 30-40).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the ad at the time

the invention was made to apply Barnett's teaching of the user can select individual

event categories and/or subdivisions for display in Favorite Events pages 313-315.

Selecting an event category in this manner is referred to as "subscribing" to the event

category. Favorite Events pages 313-315 display selected events in either a Day View

313, a Week View 314, or a Month View 315. Pages 313-315 allow a user to select

individual events from the selected categories, to be added to the personal calendar.

The user can also access an Edit Favorites page 316 which allows him or her to add

or remove categories and/or subdivisions from display in favorite Events pages

313-315. The user can set up a group calendar, specifying the members in the group,

where every group member can access the calendar and make changes to it. Different

levels of access can be specified for different members of the group. The user can

also impod events from other users' calendars. In addition, purchases of products,

services, or tickets can be effected using links associated with displayed

events to Vincent's system in order to allow a user to specify categories of events, to

view events belonging to the specified categories from outside sources, and to add

selected events from the outside sources to a personal calendar.

As to claim 15, Vincent does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein

first time-slot includes a time-slot of one specific date, a corresponding time-slot

on each of a number of week days of a week, or a corresponding time-slot on each of

a week day of a number of weeks". Barnett teaches time slot includes a time slot

of a date corresponding to a number week days of a week (figs. 9 & 13).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Vincent's teaching of time slot includes a time

slot of a date corresponding to a number week days of a week to Vincent's system in

order to provide a improve method of scheduling meetings which permits an operator to

select desired times, dates and attendees correctly.

As to claim 16, Vincent does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "including

the computer system facilitating the second user in categorizing a meeting, an

appointment, a reminder, an event, an anniversary, categorizing a family event, a

school meeting, and a social event for said first user's calendar". Barnett teaches

categorizing a meeting, an event in calendar of another user as shown in fig. 13. The

above information shows it would has been obvious to categorizing different type of events such as school meeting, family event or anniversary (figs. 1 1-14).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Barnett's teaching of categorizing a meeting, an event in calendar of another user to Vincent's system in order to provide a improve method of scheduling meetings which permits an operator to select desired times, dates and attendees correctly.

As to claim 17, Vincent teaches the claimed limitation "wherein granting and/or denying access is further based on an event type of an event to be read from or written into said first time-slot by said second user" as (col. 10, lines 40-60).

As to claim 29, Vincent teaches the claimed limitations:

"computer readable medium" as removable storage (col. 6, lines 20-30).,

"storage medium" as disk (col. 6, lines 20-25)., and

"a number of programming instructions stored in the storage medium, and designed to program an apparatus" as (col. 6, lines 20-35) "to enable the apparatus to designate one or more defined access privileges to a plurality of time-slots of a first user's calendar for a user group or user type or both" as designated a plurality of access levels to a plurality of time slots of a owner's calendar for an administrative assistant type and not for a user group (col. 9, lines 52-67., col. 10, lines 1-10),

"grant or deny access to a first time-slot of the plurality of time-slots to said

second user in accordance with the one or more defined access privileges for the first

time-slot of the user group or type or both determined for said second user" as grant

access to a owner's calendar of the plurality of time-slots in accordance with access

level 3 for the start time slot of user type and not the user group (col. 10, lines 20-40),

"wherein the one or more defined access privileges are defined for specific time-

slots of the plurality of time-slots of the first party's calendar" as there are 5 levels of

access permission not including the access permission level established for an owner

to view his own calendar that includes time slots. The above information shows that the

system defined access levels for time slots of the calendar (col. 9,lines 60-67; col. 10,

lines 3-5).

Vincent does not explicitly the claimed limitation "that a second user being a member

of said user group or type or both". Barnett teaches a user can set up a

group calendar, specifying the members in the group, where every group member can

access the calendar and make changes to it. Different levels of access can be specified

for different member members of the group (col. 2, lines 61-64).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Barnett's teaching of a user can set up a group

calendar, specifying the members in the group, where every group member can access

the calendar and make changes to it. Different levels of access can be specified for

different member members of the group to Vincent's system in order to allow a user to

share selected calendar information with other user of a group in a security level

access.

As to claim 30, Vincent teaches the claimed limitation "perform said granting or denying access based on an event type of an event to be read from or written into said first time-slot by said second user" as (fig. 5, col. 10, lines 1-30).

As to claim 31, Vincent teaches the claimed limitations:

"a processor" as processor (col. 5, lines 67-68), and

"calendar module operated by the processor" as a calendar method operated by processor (col. 5, lines 60-67), and

"adapted to facilitate designating one or more defined access privileges to a plurality of time-slots of a first user's calendar for a user group or user type or both" as designated a plurality of access levels to a plurality of time slots of a owner's calendar for an administrative assistant type and not for a user group (col. 9, lines 52-67; col. 10, lines 1 - 1 0),

"granting or denying access to a first time-slot of the plurality of time-slots to said second user in accordance with one or more defined access privileges for the first time-slot of the user group or type or both determined for said second user" as grant access to a owner's calendar of the plurality of time-slots in accordance with access level 3 for the start time slot of user type and not the user group (col. 10, lines 20-40),

"wherein the one or more defined access privileges are defined for specific time-slots of the plurality of time-slots of the firs party's calendar" as there are 5 levels of

access permission not including the access permission level established for an owner

to view his own calendar that includes time slots. The above information shows that the

system defined access levels for time slots of the calendar (col. 9,lines 60-67; col. 10,

lines 3-5).

Vincent does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "determining that a

second user being a member of said user group or type or both".

Barnett teaches a user can set up a group calendar, specifying the members in

the group, where every group member can access the calendar and make changes to it.

Different levels of access can be specified for different member members of the group

(col. 2, lines 61- 64).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the ad at the time

the invention was made to apply Barnett's teaching to Vincent's system in order to allow

a user to share selected calendar information with other users of a group in a security

level access.

As to claim 32, Vincent teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the calendar

module is further adapted to perform said panting and/or denying access based on an

event type of an event to be read from or written into said first time-slot by said

second user" as (col. 10, lines 1-30).

5.   Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vincent

(US 4881 179) in view of Barnett et al (or hereinafter "Barnett") (US 6369840) and

further in view of Falkenhainer et al (or hereinafter "Falkenhainer") (US 5930801).

As to claim 7, Vincent teaches the claimed limitation "and an ability viewing an

entry in said first time-slot" as (fig. 5). Vincent does not explicit teaches the claimed

limitation "wherein the access privileges include an access privilege with an ability of

writing an entry into said first time-slot". Falkenhainer teaches access privilege with

an ability of writing (fig. 2, col. 60-67).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Falkenhainer's teaching of access privilege with an

ability of writing to Vincent's system in order to prevent non-authority user to modify an

owner's calendar without permission and further to allow a owner of a record to update

a entry in a record.

(10) Response to Argument

10.1) Appellant stated that "the access is defined for the event, not for the time-

slot".

In response: Examiner respectfully disagrees. Vincent teaches as shown in fig.

5, column 38, an owner's calendar has time-slots. Each time-slot has start time and end

time. Specific Time-slots of owner calendar such as 5:00pm-6pm and 8pm are

indicated as **Access Permission Required.**

In particularly, Vincent teaches each event has a time-slot including start time and end time or each time-slot has an event (fig. 6). The user first enters the start and end times of the event being calendared into columns 47 and 48 respectively. A security classification is then entered into column 51 (col. 9, lines 30-32). For example, when the 9:00am to Noon event shown in fig. 4A was entered in the system, the busy bar in column 42 was displayed. When the 11:00am to 12:30 pm entry was entered, the busy bar 58 was displayed in second column to signify a conflict of events for the period or time slots 11:00am to Noon (col. 9, lines 5-11).

Clearly, Access Permissions are defined for both time-slots and events.

10.2) Appellant stated that "there is no teaching or suggestion of the above discussed time-slot based calendaring method".

In response: Examiner respectfully disagrees. Vincent teaches a time-slot based calendaring method (figs. 4A, 5-6).

In addition, Vincent teaches when the 9:00am to Noon event shown in fig. 4A was entered in the system, the busy bar in column 42 was displayed. When the 11:00am to 12:30 pm entry was entered, the busy bar 58 was displayed in second column to signify a conflict of events for the period or time slots 11:00am to Noon (col. 9, lines 5-11).

10.3) Appellant stated that Barnett does not teach or suggest defining access privileges based on specific time-slots or neither reference teaches time-slot based access privileges as recited in claim 1.

In response: Examiner respectfully disagrees. The limitation "defining access privileges based on specific time-slots or time-slots based access privileges" is not recited correctly in claim 1.

However, Vincent teaches the recited limitation "the one or more defined access privileges are defined for specific time-slots of the plurality of time-slots of the first party's calendar" in claim 1 as shown in fig. 5, column 38, an owner's calendar has time-slots. Each time-slot has start time and end time. Specific Time-slots of owner calendar such as 5:00pm-6pm and 8pm are indicated as **Access Permission Required. The owner's calendar is represented as a first party's calendar.**

In particularly, Vincent teaches each event has a time-slot including start time and end time or each time-slot has an event (fig. 6). The user first enters the start and end times of the event being calendared into columns 47 and 48 respectively. A security classification is then entered into column 51 (col. 9, lines 30-32). For example, when the 9:00am to Noon event shown in fig. 4A was entered in the system, the busy bar in column 42 was displayed. When the 11:00am to 12:30 pm entry was entered, the busy bar 58 was displayed in second column to signify a conflict of events for the period or time slots 11:00am to Noon (col. 9, lines 5-11).

Clearly, Access Permissions are defined for both time-slots of events and events of time-slots.

Thus, Vincent teaches the one or more defined access privileges are defined for specific time-slots of the plurality of time-slots of the first party's calendar" in claim 1

10.4) Appellant stated "the cited references, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a computer implemented method comprising receiving an input for a first time-slot of a plurality of time-slots of a first party's calendar from a second party, the first and second parties being different parties, and the second party being associated with a group affiliation or a user type or both, and the group affiliation or user type or both having one or more defined access privileges, wherein the one or more defined access privileges are defined for specific time-slots of the plurality of time-slots of the first party's calendar; and processing said received input in accordance with the access privilege of the second party's associated group affiliation or user type or both for the first time-slot".

In response: Examiner respectfully disagrees. Vincent teaches the claimed limitations:

"receiving an input for a first time-slot of a plurality of time-slots of a first party's calendar from a second party" as receiving a non-owner or a user first enters the start time and end times of the event being calendared into columns 47 and 48 of an owner's L.M. The owner L.M is represented as a first party. The non-owner is represented as a second party (fig. 4A, col. 9, lines 30-32; col. 10, lines 22-30),

"the first and second parties being different parties" as serving a request by a user to view the calendar of another user (col. 10, lines 15-16). For example, fig. 5

represents the screen displayed to a non-owner who has requested a view of the day

calendar of L.M (owner). The above information shows the non-owner or a user whom

request for viewing and L.M or owner are different parties;

"the second party being associated with a group affiliation or a user type or both"

as serving a request by a user to view the calendar of another user (col. 10, lines 15-

16). For example, fig. 5 represents the screen displayed to a non-owner who has

requested a view of the day calendar of L.M (owner). The user, who requests for

viewing calendar of another user such as L.M, is non-owner. The L.M is owner as user

type. As discussed above, the user who requests for viewing calendar of another user

such as L.M, is associated with owner as user type;

"the group affiliation or user type or both having one or more defined access

privileges" as fig. 5 represents the screen displayed to a non-owner who has requested

a view of the day calendar of L.M (owner) (col. 10, lines 20-30). L.M is an owner as

user type having defined access permission for timeslots 5:00pm to 6:00pm and

8:00pm;

"wherein the one or more defined access privileges are defined for

specific time-slots of the plurality of time-slots of the first party's calendar" as at a time

slot 5pm to 6pm Access permission required, at another time slot 8:00 pm Access

permission required (fig. 5). The above information shows that access privileges are

defined for time-slots.

In particularly, each event has a time-slot including start time and end time or

each time-slot has an event (fig. 6). The user first enters the start and end times of the

event being calendared into columns 47 and 48 respectively. A security classification is

then entered into column 51 (col. 9, lines 30-32). For example, when the 9:00am to

Noon event shown in fig. 4A was entered in the system, the busy bar in column 42 was

displayed. When the 11:00am to 12:30 pm entry was entered, the busy bar 58 was

displayed in second column to signify a conflict of events for the period or time slots

11:00am to Noon (col. 9, lines 5-11).

Clearly, Access Permissions are defined for both time-slots of events and

events of time-slots.

Vincent does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "processing said received

input in accordance with the access privilege of the second party's associated group

affiliation or user type or both for the first time-slot".

Barnett teaches accepting input specifying a group of users to have access to the

group calendar, designating a permitted level of access for each user in the group, and

then accepting input from a second user requesting access to the group calendar (col.

28, lines 50-55). Pages 313-315 allow a user to select individual events from the

selected categories, to be added to the personal calendar (col. 8, lines 35-37). For

example, after a user clicks on one or more box 904 in time slots as shown in fig. 9 and

then clicks on button 807, the events are added to his or her personal calendar (col. 12,

lines 40-41, figs. 9&14).

Clearly, events that are clicked by a user are processed in according to a

permitted level of access for each user in the group affiliation. A permitted level of

access is represented as access privilege.

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Barnett's teaching of after a user clicks on one or more

box 904 in time slots as shown in fig. 9 and then clicks on button 807, the events are

added to user calendar according to a permitted level of access for each user in the

group to Vincent's system in order to allow a user to add information from an owner's

calendar to his or her calendar in sequence of time accordance with a security access

level to prevent network traffic or to prevent copying owner's information without

permission .

As discussed above the combination of cited references teaches the above

claimed limitation.

10.5) Applicant stated "the Examiner failed to provide a sufficient factual basis to

support a prima facie case of obviousness of claims 1-5, 7-17, and 29-32 over any

combination of cited references".

In response to the preceding arguments, the examiner respectfully

submits that in order for references to be combinable to reasonably establish a

prima facie case of obviousness under 35 USC 103, they must be analogous.

In this case, the instant application is concerned to a method for defining

access privileges for time-slots of a party calendar.

As discussed in the office action, Vincent teaches a method for generating

and displaying events as it is being calendared. Each event has a time slot

including a start time and end time in a calendar (figs. 5, 6).

Similarly, Barnett discloses a method for generating and displaying calendar user-selected events as they are being calendared. Each event has a time-slot (figs. 9& 10).

Importantly, Barnett teaches accepting input specifying a group of users to have access to the group calendar, designating a permitted level of access for each user in the group, and then accepting input from a second user requesting access to the group calendar (col. 28, lines 50-55). Pages 313-315 allow a user to select individual events from the selected categories, to be added to the personal calendar (col. 8, lines 35-37). For example, after a user clicks on one or more box 904 in time slots as shown in fig. 9 and then clicks on button 807, the events are added to his or her personal calendar (col. 12, lines 40-41, figs. 9&14).

Clearly, the applied references, Vincent and Barnett are all concerned to a method for generating and displaying events as it is being calendared. Each event has a time slot including a start time and end time in a calendar. Thus, these references are analogous and within the same aspects of endeavor and are combinable.

As discussed above, a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would recognize the advantage of Barnett to add the Barnett's step of after a user clicks on one or more box 904 in time slots as shown in fig. 9 and then clicks on button 807, the events are added to his or her personal calendar according to access level of a user in the group to Vincent's system in order to allow a user to add or update information from an owner's calendar to his or her calendar in sequence of time

accordance with a security access level to prevent network traffic or to prevent copying

owner's information without permission .

        10.6) Appellant agued that Vincent does not teach "provide for an access

privilege having the ability to write data into the first time-slot".

        In response: Examiner respectfully disagrees. Vincent teaches the user first

enters the start and end times of the event being calendared into columns 47 and 48

(col. 9, lines 30-31). As shown in fig. 4A, when the 9:00am to Noon event shown in fig.

4A was entered in the system, the busy bar in column 42 was displayed. When the

11:00am to 12:30 pm entry was entered, the busy bar 58 was displayed in second

column to signify a conflict of events for the period or time slots 11:00am to Noon (col.

9, lines 5-11). The above information implies that a user has a permission for entering

events into timeslots.

        In addition, Barnett teaches events are entered in timeslots such as Sat 21 at

12:30 and Sun 22 at 5:20 (fig. 9). Barnett teaches accepting input specifying a group of

users to have access to the group calendar, designating a permitted level of access for

each user in the group, and then accepting input from a second user requesting access

to the group calendar (col. 28, lines 50-55).

        The above information clearly shows that a user has permitted level of access for

writing events into timeslots such as Sat 21 at 12:30 and Sun 22 at 5:20.

10.7) Appellant agued that Vincent does not teach "providing access privileges including an access privilege with an ability of writing an entry into said first time-slot" in claim 7.

In response: Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Vincent teaches the user first enters the start and end times of the event being calendared into columns 47 and 48 (col. 9, lines 30-31). As shown in fig. 4A, when the 9:00am to Noon event shown in fig. 4A was entered in the system, the busy bar in column 42 was displayed. When the 11:00am to 12:30 pm entry was entered, the busy bar 58 was displayed in second column to signify a conflict of events for the period or time slots 11:00am to Noon (col. 9, lines 5-11).

In addition, Barnett teaches events are entered in timeslots such as Sat 21 at 12:30 and Sun 22 at 5:20 (fig. 9). Barnett teaches accepting input specifying a group of users to have access to the group calendar, designating a permitted level of access for each user in the group, and then accepting input from a second user requesting access to the group calendar (col. 28, lines 50-55).

Falkenhainer teaches access privilege of access privileges having an ability of writing (fig. 2, col. 2, lines 60-67).

As discussed above, the combination of Vincent, Barnett and Falkenhainer teaches providing access privileges including an access privilege with an ability of writing an entry into said first time-slot" as recited in claim 7.

10.8) Appellant agued that the combination of Vincent, Barnett and Falkenhainer fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness.

In response to the preceding arguments, the examiner respectfully submits that in order for references to be combinable to reasonably establish a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 USC 103, they must be analogous.

In this case, the instant application is concerned to a method for defining access privileges for time-slots of a party calendar.

As discussed in the office action, Vincent teaches a method for generating and displaying events as it is being calendared. Each event has a time slot including a start time and end time in a calendar indicated access permissions (figs. 5,6).

Similarly, Falkenhainer teaches access privilege of access privileges having an ability of writing (fig. 2, col. 2, lines 60-67).

Clearly, the applied references, Vincent and Barnett are all concerned to access privileges. Thus, these references are analogous and within the same aspects of endeavor and are combinable.

As discussed above, a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would recognize the advantage of Falkenhainer's teaching of access privilege with an ability of writing to Vincent's system in order to prevent non-authority user to modify an owner's calendar without permission and further to allow a owner of a record to update a entry in a record.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the

Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/Cam Y Truong/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2162

Conferees:

Breene, John (SPE, Art Unit: 2162)

/John Breene/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2162

Trujillo, James (SPE, Art Unit: 2169)

/James K. Trujillo/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2169